

Claims 2-4 is submitted as allowable over the cited reference for the same reasons as above based on their dependancy, and reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Regarding Claim 6, prior art cited (Patent #6,297,548) shows the components internal to the enclosure being stacked and aligned but makes no mention of stacking chip package enclosures upon each other, as this would be impossible in the BGA device show due to the solder balls on the bottom surface. The prior art only demonstrates how components can be stacked inside of the enclosure, whereas Applicant claims how to stack the enclosures. Claim 6 is submitted as allowable over the cited references and reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Prior art cited (Patent #6,297,548) makes no mention of ergonomic features, and a beveled edge or angled corners are not ergonomic in nature, as they continue to have a sharp angle. The edges would need to be rounded, as in Application, to conform to ergonomic guidelines. As stated in the American Occupational Therapy Associations guide to Ergonomic Product Design, "products should have no sharp edges or corners, rather rounded corners are required. A beveled edge does not provide ergonomic function, as the edges must be rounded." Therefore, prior art would not pass the accepted guidelines for ergonomics. Claim 7 is submitted as allowable over the cited references and reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Other US Patents sited have been reviewed but do not demonstrate prior art pertinent to applicants disclosure, as none discuss the attachment, support, alignment, or ergonomics of an electronics enclosure.

Therefore it is submitted that patentable subject material is clearly present. If the examiner agrees but does not feel that the present claims are technically adequate, appliant respectfully requests that the examiner write acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j).

For all of the reasons given above, applicant respectfully submits that the claims comply with Section 112, the claims define over the prior art under Section 102 as the claims refer to an enclosure external features for connection to realworld structures, and the claimed distinctions are of patentable merit under Section 103. Accordingly, applicant submits that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits.

Very respectfully,

David A. Rivkin

1390 Curtiss Avenue, San Jose, CA USA 95125

208-246-5494 david.rivkin@sciessence.com